

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner has maintained the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 11 - 16 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Yeivin et al. (WO 00/60477; hereinafter "Yeivin").

In response to the Examiner's rejection, the Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to recite that the communication handler is adapted to be programmable to perform transformations of the data stream at a bit-level in accordance with a communication protocol and re-programmable to perform transformations of the data stream in accordance with a modified or different protocol. Basis for this amendment can be found in the specification on page 16, line 29 through 31 and page 17, lines 6 through 9. Claim 13 has been similarly amended by including the subject matter of claim 14. Claim 14 has been canceled.

Yeivin does not show or suggest a communication controller as claimed in amended claims 1 and 13. Yeivin, at page 7, lines 20 - 22, states that high speed data streams associated with a variety of communication protocols can be handled. However, Yeivin does not state that the communication controller is re-programmable to perform transformations of the data stream in accordance with a modified or different protocol. Also, Yeivin states at page 9, line 31 to page 10, line 2, that each peripheral comprises a state machine which is "tailored" to at least one communication protocol. The applicant believes that "tailored" as used in Yeivin, means that the state machine has been specifically designed for a specific one or more communication protocols. Therefore, the Applicant believes that independent claims 1 and 13, as amended herein, are allowable over Yeivin et al. The Applicant believes that the comments above regarding the rejection of claims 1 and 13 also apply to the rejection of claims 2, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, and 18 - 20, and that claims 2, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, and 18 - 20 are allowable over Yeivin et al.

Claims 3 - 5 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeivin et al. in view of Adams et al. Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as applied to Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 11 - 16, and 18 - 20 above and further in view of Edwards et al. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as applied to Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 11 - 16, and 18 - 20 above and further in view of Sarpangal and Scherpier. The Applicant believes that the comments above

regarding the rejection of Claims 1 and 13 also applies to the rejection of Claims 3 - 5, 9, 10, and 17, and that Claims 3 - 5, 9, 10, and 17 allowable over the cited art.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless the applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Believing to have responded to each and every rejection contained in the Office Action mailed December 3, 2004, the applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1 - 5 and 7 - 13, and 15 - 20; thereby placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

By:



Daniel D. Hill

Attorney of Record

Reg. No.: 35,895

Telephone: 512-996-6839

Fax No.: (512) 996-6853